



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,488	11/02/2000	Paul J. Russell	CIS00-3505	4837

7590 12/08/2003

Barry W Chapin Esq
CHAPIN & HUANG LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/704,488

Applicant(s)

RUSSELL, PAUL J.

Examiner

Benjamin R Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Detailed Action

Claims 1-43 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on paper 2 has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "common object definitions" on line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "generating a signal" on line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Does applicant mean setting a flag or signaling to the server or to the client?

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the object creation right " on line 23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "in response to determining that the server properly created the global object specification" on line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,460 by Simonoff (Applicant IDS).

Regarding claim 1, in a client computer system, a method for defining objects, the method comprising the steps of (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56):

providing a local object specification to a server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3; local object specifications are taken to be user objects) and

receiving a global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6), the global object specification including at least one global object definition having a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 16, lines 25-29).

generating a signal indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-31; where the signal is the wrapper and the common object definitions are the unique identifiers).

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1 wherein the step of providing the local object specification to the server includes the steps of (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3; local object specifications are taken to be user objects):

reserving an object creation right with the server (Simonoff: col. 15, lines 65-66; col. 16, lines 3-25; empty wrapper);

in response to reserving the object creation right with the server, defining the local object specification to include at least one local object definition and a corresponding local object identification that is unique to the at least one local object on the client (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-33); and

transferring the local object specification to the server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3).

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 2 wherein the step of reserving an object creation right with the server includes the step of (Simonoff: col. 15, lines 65-66; col. 16, lines 3-25; empty wrapper):

checking for an existence of an object specification on the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 10-14; where the object is a graphic), and if no object specification exists on the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 10-14), creating a reservation object specification on the server in order to reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 8-12, 16-17), and if an object specification exists on the server, receiving a denial of the object creation right for the client (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 1 wherein the step of generating a signal indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions includes the steps of (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-31; where the signal is the wrapper and the common object definitions are the unique identifiers):

checking whether the global object specification contains a corresponding global object definition for each respective local object defined in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 44-49) and

if the global object specification contains a corresponding global object definition for each respective local object defined in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, 25-29), then replacing the local object specification in the client with the global object specification received from the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 21-31; selected object placed in the wrapper); and

if the global object specification does, not contain a corresponding global object definition for each respective local object defined in the local object specification, then providing the indication of an error to the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 5, the method of claim 1 wherein the signal indicates that the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions and wherein the method further comprising the steps of (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-31; where the signal is the wrapper and the common object definitions are the unique identifiers):

in response to the signal indicating that the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions, providing a confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification to the server (Simonoff: col. 18, 10-11) to indicate to the server to send an update to other clients such that the other clients can create objects in conjunction with the server (Simonoff: col. 23, lines 17-22, 24-29); and

releasing the object creation right with the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 8-10, 18-19).

Regarding 6, the method of claim 5 wherein the step of releasing the object creation right with the server comprises the step of (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 8-10, 18-19):

providing an indication to the server to delete a reservation object specification on the server that reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 51-64).

Regarding claim 7, the method of claim 1 wherein the step of receiving the global object specification receives a global object specification containing global object definitions that correspond to respective local object definitions in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 16, lines 25-29), the global object definitions having respective global object identifications that are unique amongst all global object definitions created by the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 7 wherein:

the client is client collaboration software performing on a client computer system involved in a collaboration session with the server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 57 - 63);

the server is collaboration adapter software operating on a collaboration computer system (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; Figures 2 and 3); and

wherein the method further comprises the step of:
in response to determining that the server properly created the global object specification, providing confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification to the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 10-11) such that the server can update the global object specification of other client computer systems performing client collaboration software such that all clients involved in the collaboration session with the server contain the global object definitions having unique global object identifications (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 9, in a server computer system, a method for defining objects, the method comprising the steps of (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56):

receiving a local object specification from a client (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3);

for each local object definition in the local object specification, defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 16, lines 25-29, lines 44-49); and
providing the global object specification to the client (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 9 wherein the step of defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification comprises the steps of (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 16, lines 25-29, lines 44-49):

creating a global object definition that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29);

generating an object identification for the unique global object identification that is unique amongst all global object identifications assigned to any existing global object definitions known to the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29); and

assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition such that the global object definition is uniquely identified amongst all global object definitions (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 11, the method of claim 10 wherein the step of creating a global object definition that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds comprises the step of (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29):

copying the local object definition in the local object specification to a global object definition within the global object specification to generate the global object definition which is a copy of the local object definition (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3); and

wherein the step of assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition replaces the local object identification copied to the global object definition with the unique global object identification generated by the step of generating an object identification for the unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 12, the method of claim 9 further including the step of:
associating the global object definition to the global object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 13, the method of claim 9 further comprising the steps of:
receiving, from a client, a request to reserve an object creation right on the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31); and
checking if the client is able to create an object on the server, and if the client is able to create an object on the server, returning an object creation right to the client (Simonoff: col. 17, lines 12-31), and
if the client is not able to create an object on the server, providing a denial of the object creation right to the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31).

Regarding claim 14, the method of claim 13 wherein the step of receiving, from a client, a request to reserve an object creation right on the server comprises the steps of (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31):

receiving an attempt to create a reservation object specification from the client in order to reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31); and

wherein, if the step of checking if the client is able to create an object on the server determines that the client is able to create an object in the server, the method further includes the step of (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31):

creating a reservation object specification on the server in order to reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31).

Regarding claim 15, the method of claim 13 further comprising the steps of:

in response to returning the object creation right to the client, receiving, from a client, a reservation object specification on the server that reserves the object creation right on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31; col. 15, lines 65-66; col. 16, lines 3-25); and

creating the reservation object specification on the server in order to reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 15, lines 65-66; col. 16, lines 3-25; wrapper object).

Regarding claim 16, the method of claim 9 further comprising the steps of:
receiving a confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification provided to the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 10, 11); and
providing a global object specification update to other clients such that the other clients can retrieve the global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 23, lines 26-30).

Regarding claim 17, the method of claim 16 further comprising the steps of:
receiving a request from the other clients for the global object specification (Simonoff: col. 12, lines 49-61); and
in response to receiving the request from the other clients for the global object specification, providing the global object specification to the other clients (Simonoff: col. 12, lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 18, a method for defining shared objects on a client and a server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56), the method comprising the steps of:
providing, from the client, a local object specification to the server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3);
receiving, in the server, the local object specification from the client (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3; storing);
in the server, for each local object definition in the local object specification, defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29);
providing, from the server, the global object specification to the client receiving, at the client, the global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 12, lines 61-67); and
comparing, in the client, the global object specification to the local object specification to determine that the server properly created the global object specification based upon the local

object specification (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6), and if the server properly created the global object specification, replacing the local object specification in the client with the global object specification received from the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 16-17), and if the server improperly created a global object specification, providing from the client an indication of an error to the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 19,

The Simonoff reference teaches a client computer system comprising:

an interface (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 50-54);

a processor (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 24; inherent in a computer as describe for the server; col. 8, line 66);

a memory system (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 24; inherent in a computer as describe for the server; col. 8, line 61); and

an interconnection mechanism coupling the interface, the processor and the memory system (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 24-29);

wherein the memory system is encoded with an client object manager process that, when performed on the processor (Simonoff: col. 9, line 46-57), operates as a client to cause the client computer system to define shared objects by performing the operations of (Simonoff: col. 9, line 46-57):

providing a local object specification defined in the memory system to a server via the interface (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6);

receiving, in the memory system, a global object specification from the server via the interface (Simonoff: col. 9, line 46-57); and

generating a signal in the memory system indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions having respective unique object identifiers (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 8-31).

Regarding claim 20, the client computer system of claim 19 wherein when the processor performs the operation of providing the local object specification to the server, the processor further performs the operations of (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6):

reserving an object creation right with the server (Simonoff: col. 15, lines 65-66; col. 16, lines 3-25; col. 18, lines 12-31); and

in response to reserving the object creation right with the server, defining a local object specification in the memory system to include at least one local object definition and a corresponding local object identification that is unique to the at least one local object on the client (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29); and

transferring the local object specification to the server via the interface (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 46-58; lines 25-31).

Regarding claim 21, the client computer system of claim 20 wherein when the processor performs the operation of reserving an object creation right with the server (Simonoff: col. 15, lines 65-66; col. 16, lines 3-25; col. 18, lines 12-31), the processor further performs the operations of:

checking for an existence of an object specification on the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 10-14), and if no object specification exists on the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 10-14), creating a reservation object specification on the server in order to reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 8-12, 16-17), and if an object specification exists on the server, receiving, via the interface, a denial of the object creation right for the client (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 22, the client computer system of claim 20 wherein when the processor performs the operation of generating a signal indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-31; where the signal is the wrapper and the common object definitions are the unique identifiers), the processor further performs the operations of:

checking whether the global object specification contains a corresponding global object definition for each respective local object defined in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 12-14; col. 6, lines 66- col. 7, line 2);

if the global object specification contains a corresponding global object definition for each respective local object defined in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-

29), then replacing the local object specification in the memory system in the client with the global object specification received from the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 21-31); and

if the global object specification does not contain a corresponding global object definition for each respective local object defined in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 10-19), then providing the indication of an error to the server via the interface (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 23, the client computer system of claim 19 wherein the signal indicates that the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions and wherein the processor further performs the operations of (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29):

in response to the signal indicating that the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29; wrapper), providing a confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification to the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 10-11), via the interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63), to indicate to the server to send an update to other clients such that the other clients can create objects in conjunction with the server (Simonoff: col. 23, lines 17-22, 24-29); and

releasing the object creation right with the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 8-10, 18-19).

Regarding claim 24, the client computer system of claim 23 wherein when the processor performs the operation of releasing the object creation right with the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 8-10, 18-19; col. 18, lines 12-31), the processor performs the operation of providing an indication to the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 54-57), via the interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63), to delete a reservation object specification on the server that reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 51-64).

Regarding claim 25, the client computer system of claim 19 wherein when the processor performs the operation of receiving the global object specification the processor performs the operation of (Simonoff: col. 9, line 46-57):

receiving, via the interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63), a global object specification containing global object definitions that correspond to respective local object definitions in the local object specification (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6), the global object definitions having respective global object identifications that are unique amongst all global object definitions created by the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 26, the client computer system of claim 25 wherein:

the client is client collaboration software performing on a client computer system involved in a collaboration session with the server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 57-63);

the server is collaboration adapter software operating on a collaboration computer system (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; Figures 2 and 3); and

wherein the processor further performs the operation of:

in response to determining that the server properly created the global object specification, providing confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification to the server via the interface such that the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 10-11) can update the global object specification of other client computer systems performing client collaboration software such that all clients involved in the collaboration session with the server contain the global object definitions having unique global object identifications (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 27, a server computer system comprising:

an interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62,63);

a processor (Simonoff: col. 8, line 61);

a memory system (Simonoff: col. 8, line 61); and

an interconnection mechanism coupling the interface, the processor and the memory system (Simonoff: col. 8, line 62);

wherein the memory system is encoded with a server object manager process that, when performed on the processor, operates as a server to cause the server computer system to define objects by performing the operations of (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56):

receiving a local object specification from a client via the interface (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 55- col. 7, line 3);

for each local object definition in the local object specification, defining, within a global object specification in the memory system, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 16, lines 25-29); and

providing the global object specification from the memory system to the client via the interface (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6).

Regarding claim 28, the server computer system of claim 27 wherein when the processor performs the operation of defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification the processor performs the operations of (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29):

creating a global object definition in the memory system that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29, lines 41-49); and

generating an object identification for the unique global object identification that is unique amongst all global object identifications assigned to any existing global object definitions known to the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29); and

assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition in the memory system such that the global object definition is uniquely identified amongst all global object definitions in the memory system (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 29, the server computer system of claim 28 wherein when the processor performs the operation of creating a global object definition that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds the processor performs the operations of (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29):

copying the local object definition in the local object specification to a global object definition within the global object specification to generate the global object definition which is a copy of the local object definition (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 3; col. 18, lines 54-57); and

wherein the step of assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition replaces the local object identification copied to the global object definition with the unique global object identification generated by the step of generating an object identification for the unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 30, the server computer system of claim 29 wherein the processor further performs the operation of associating the global object definition to the global object specification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 31, the server computer system of claim 27 wherein the processor further performs the operations of:

receiving, from a client, a request to reserve an object creation right on the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31); and

checking if the client is able to create an object on the server, and if the client is able to create an object on the server, returning an object creation right to the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31), and

if the client is not able to create an object on the server, providing a denial of the object creation right to the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31).

Regarding claim 32, the server computer system of claim 31 wherein when the processor performs the operation of receiving, from a client, a request to reserve an object creation right on the server, the processor performs the operations of (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31):

receiving, via the interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63), an attempt to create a reservation object specification from the client in order to reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31); and

wherein, if the step of checking if the client is able to create an object on the server determines that the client is able to create an object in the server, the method further includes the step of (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31):

creating a reservation object specification on the server in order to reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31).

Regarding claim 33, the server computer system of claim 31 wherein the processor further performs the operations of:

in response to returning the object creation right to the client, receiving, from a client via the interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63), a reservation object specification on the server that reserves the object creation right on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31; col. 15, lines 55-66; col. 16, lines 3-25); and

creating the reservation object specification in the memory system on the server in order to reserve the object creation right with the server on behalf of the client (Simonoff: col. 15, lines 55-66; col. 16, lines 3-25).

Regarding claim 34, the server computer system of claim 27 wherein the processor further performs the operations of:

receiving, via the interface from the client (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63), a confirmation of acceptance of the global object specification provided to the client (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 10-11); and

providing a global object specification update, via the interface (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 62-63) to other clients such that the other clients can retrieve the global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 23, lines 26-30).

Regarding claim 35, the server computer system of claim 26 wherein the processor further performs the operations of:

receiving, via the interface, a request from the other clients for the global object specification in the memory system (Simonoff: col. 12, lines 49-61); and

in response to receiving the request from the other clients for the global object specification, providing the global object specification in the memory system to the other clients via the interface (Simonoff: col. 12, lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 36, the server computer system of claim 27 wherein the server computer system is a collaboration server and wherein the server object manager process encoded in the

memory system is server collaboration software that (Simonoff: col. 8, lines 19-24), when performed on the processor, operates as a collaboration server to allow distribution of the global object specification to multiple client computer systems involved in a collaboration session (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 8, lines 19-24).

Regarding claim 37, a system for defining objects on a client and a server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56), the system comprising the steps of:

- a client computer system configured with a client (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 46-50);
- a server computer system configured with a server (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 29-35);
- a network interconnecting the client computer system and the server computer system (Simonoff: col. 9, lines 3-11);
- the client providing a local object specification to the server via the network (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66-col. 7, line 2);
- the server receiving the local object specification from the client via the network (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 9, lines 3-11);
- for each local object definition in the local object specification, the server defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29);
- the server providing the global object specification to the client via the network (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 9, lines 3-11);
- the client receiving the global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6; col. 9, lines 3-11); and
- the client comparing the global object specification to the local object specification to determine whether the server properly created the global object specification based upon the local object specification by determining whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6), and if the server properly created the global object specification, replacing the local object specification in the client with the global object specification received from the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 16-17), and if the server improperly created a global object specification, providing from the client an indication of an error to the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 18-19).

Regarding claim 38, a computer program product having a computer-readable medium including computer program logic encoded thereon for defining objects in a client (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56), such that the computer program logic, when performed on at least one processor within a client computer system, causes the at least one processor to perform the operations of:

- providing a local object specification to a server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66- col. 7, line 2);
- receiving a global object specification from the server (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6); and
- generating a signal indicating whether the global object specification and the local object specification define common object definitions having respective unique object identifiers (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 8-31).

Regarding claim 39, a computer program product having a computer-readable medium including computer program logic encoded thereon for defining objects in a server (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 44-56), such that the computer program logic, when performed on at least one processor within a server computer system, causes the at least one processor to perform the operations of:

- receiving a local object specification from a client (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6);
- for each local object definition in the local object specification, defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29); and
- providing the global object specification to the client (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6).

Regarding claim 40, the computer program product of claim 39 wherein the computer program logic that causes the at least one processor to perform the operation of defining, within a global object specification, a corresponding global object definition including a unique global object identification (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29), comprises computer program logic that when performed on the processor, causes the at least one processor to perform the operations of:

creating a global object definition that contains object properties equivalent to object properties of the local object definition to which the global object definition corresponds (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29);

generating an object identification for the unique global object identification that is unique amongst all global object identifications assigned to any existing global object definitions known to the server (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29); and

assigning the unique global object identification to the global object definition such that the global object definition is uniquely identified amongst all global object definitions (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 41, in a client computer system, a method for performing object operations, the method comprising the steps of:

providing an object operation to a server from a client performing on the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66- col. 7, line 2);

receiving, at the client, a global object specification update from the server, the global object specification update indicating that the server performed the object operation on a global object specification maintained by the server (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6); and

in response to receiving the global object specification update, performing the object operation on a global object specification maintained by the client (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6).

Regarding claim 42, the method of claim of claim 41 wherein the object operation is a create object operation, and wherein the step of providing the object operation to a server comprises the steps of:

defining at least one object property for a global object definition to be created by the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 12-31);

providing the object operation to the server including the at least one object property (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 2); and

wherein the step of receiving receives the global object specification update containing a new global object identification for a new global object definition to be created in the global

object specification in the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29; col. 7, lines 2-6); and

wherein the step of performing the object operation on a global object specification maintained by the client includes the steps of (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66- col. 7, line 2):

generating the global object definition within the global object specification on the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 16, lines 25-29), the global object definition containing the at least one object property and containing the global object identification received from the global object specification update (Simonoff: col. 7, lines 2-6).

Regarding claim 43, the method of claim of claim 41 wherein the object operation is a delete object operation, and wherein the step of providing the object operation to a server comprises the steps of:

defining at least one object property for a global object definition to be deleted from a global object specification maintained by the server (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 51-64);

providing the object operation to the server including the at least one object property (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66- col. 7, line 2); and

wherein the step of receiving receives the global object specification update containing a global object identification of an existing global object definition in the global object specification in the client computer system (Simonoff: col. 6, lines 66 – col. 7, line 6); and

wherein the step of performing the object operation on a global object specification maintained by the client includes the steps of:

removing a global object definition within the global object specification that corresponds to the global object identification received from the global object specification update (Simonoff: col. 18, lines 51-64).

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 5,522,077 issued to Cuthbert et al.

U. S. Patent No. 6,209,018 issued to Ben-Shachar et al.

U. S. Patent No. 6,446,113 issued to Ozzie et al.

U. S. Patent No. 6,289,389 issued to Bowman-Amuah.

U. S. Patent No. 5,515,491 issued to Bates et al.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

brb **BRB**
November 26, 2003


PATRICE WINDER
PRIMARY EXAMINER